

FILED

2011 FEB 15 P 10:49

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
for the Eastern District of Virginia  
~~GENERAL DISTRICT OF FAIRFAX VIRGINIA~~  
Alexandria Division

Thanh Tang ) Case No: 1:11 CV 155  
In Propria Persona ) L0/JFA  
ACTION OF TRESPASS  
Vs. )  
NORTHWEST FEDERAL CREDIT UNION )  
FRIEDMAN & MACFADYEN P.A. )  
JOHNIE R MUNCY )  
RACHEL A ABRAHAM ESQ )  
GEORGE J SHAPIRO LAW OFFICES ) DEMAND GRAND JURY TRIAL  
SAMIA AHAD )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Thomas Jefferson warned that if we have a central bank the banks would take over  
and start influencing legislation so that we would have our properties taken away from  
us.

### FACT

*We the People* either in plural or in singular capacity. In singular capacity, in this case, it is Thanh Tang Grantor, one of the people as contemplated in the preambles of the Constitution for Virginia, the Constitution for the State of Virginia, and the 1789 Constitution for the United States of America. For the Record, I Thanh Tang am not a 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Citizen, nor am I US Citizen or a US Corporation, nor am I NAME or taxpayer.

### EXHAUSTION OF STATE OR ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

There is no STATE remedy for violation of Constitutional, National Banking Act, Rights, privileges, continuous harassment/threats and immunities under color of state law under STATE OF VIRGINIA statutory law and thus warranting no exhaustion of any state-based judicial or administrative remedies in this action. This is and will be a court of record at law (common law), which is action of trespass, at a later date criminal charges maybe filed.

1. Each Defendant acted in such a way, or failed to act in such a way, that Plaintiff Thanh Tang is deprived of her home, land (property) and continuous harassment/threats by forcing entry to house without permission. Each Defendant acted to deprive Plaintiff Thanh Tang/Grantor of her property; or each Defendant failed to act to prevent the loss by Plaintiff Thanh Tang of her property. Further, each Defendant is a willing participant in concert with each of the remaining Defendants.
2. At all times mentioned in this action each Defendant is the agent of the other, and

in doing the acts alleged in this action, each is acting within the course and scope of said agency.

The following paragraphs describe what the Trespassers, under color of law, either acted or failed to act as obligated.

3. Thanh Tang (herein after Plaintiff/Grantor) is one of people of the Preamble, and in this court of record at common law complains of: NORTHWEST FEDERAL CREDIT UNION (hereinafter "Defendant-A"), FRIEDMAN & MACFADYEN P.A (hereinafter "Defendant-B"), JOHNNIE R MUNCY (hereinafter "Defendant-C"), RACHEL A ABRAHAM ESQ VSB-80062 (hereinafter "Defendant-D"), GEORGE J SHAPIRO LAW OFFICES (hereinafter "Defendant-E") and SAMIA AHAD (hereinafter "Defendant-F") who are each summoned to answer the said Plaintiff in a plea action of trespass and violation of rights, to wit:

4. Defendant-B and C are DEBT COLLECTOR, which Defendant-B is employer of Defendant-C. Which Defendant-E is employer of Defendant-D; and

5. On or about March 15, 2006 Defendant-A made an allege offer of lending two hundred eighty-four thousand (\$284,000.00), which I was not given full disclosure of promissory note/securities instrument as well as Deed of Trust; and

6. Further, Defendant-B allege Defendant-A referred this allege loan to their office, thereby, claiming they are the holder of original wet-ink note as well as Trustee of original wet-ink Deed of Trust; and

7. Furthermore, Defendant-B goes to make false statement without any proof that they have a contract either with allege creditor or with alleged debtor. *Maxims of law states, "the burden of proof lies on him who asserts the facts;" and*

8. Furthermore, Title 12 USC 3753 and 3754, states only Secretary or commissioner as



designate by Secretary to foreclosure, so whose authority is Defendant-B usurpation?

9. Furthermore, If this is not enough Defendant-B and C conduct a foreclosure sale on or about November 10, 2010, located outside of courthouse door of county without due process; and

10. Further, Defendant-F fraudulently purchased property, then Defendant-F being to harass as well as trespass in Plaintiff property and changed the locks on the door as well as leaving messages on window of my property; and

11. Further, Defendant-E being sending threaten Notice of Demand, thereby causing undue stress;

12. The Defendant-A provided no consideration and no loan, and in fact through Constructive Fraud monetized the Signature of the claimant and gained a security interest in her property. The institution came to the table with no assets and pledged no assets in the fraudulent loan.

### CAUSE OF ACTION

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in her capacities. Violation of The United States Statutes at Large volume 13 stat 99-118, the National Banking Act but not limited to, by Defendant(s): *Financial Institution are limited to mortgages for five (5) years maximum;*

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. Violation of USC Title 12 section

83(a), but not limited to, *"No national bank shall make any loan or discount on the security of the shares of its own capital stock or loan money from an unidentified line of credit."*

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Violation of section 1692e of USC 15 but not limited to, *"A debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt."*

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Violation of Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on February 26, 1997, at its 1333rd session, 95<sup>th</sup> regular session, but not limited to, **Right of Property**, by Defendants.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, counter Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Conspiracies violate RICO by Deceptive Trade Practice, threat of extortion, collusion, coercion and obstruction of justice by Defendant(s) without due process of law.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Violation of 18 USC 477A Counterfeit Security Instruments resulting from depriving Plaintiff of property without due process of

law but not limited to.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. FRAUD committed intentional perversion of truth for purpose against Plaintiff to deprive of property(s).

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, counter Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Trespass against Plaintiff in unlawful manner to deprive right and property, but not limited to.

**NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, counter Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Intentional infliction of Emotional Distress and deliberately inflicted emotional distress on Plaintiff by interfering with her property and conspiring against her.

**TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION:** Paragraphs 1 through 12 of CAUSE OF ACTION are included by reference as though fully stated herein. By right, counter Plaintiff reasonably expects to proceed without injury, secure in his capacities. Violation of Title 46 Subtitle III Chapter 313 31321, thereby deprive Plaintiff of property, but not limited too.

#### **RELIEF REQUESTED OF THE COURT**

We the People Thanh Tang, wherefore demands the following relief jointly and severally against all Defendants:



- A. General damages in the amount of Two million in Federal Reserve notes or current US currency (\$2,000,000.00) from all the Defendants collectively.
- B. All costs in filing this action and all out of pocket expenses in relation to this action and for interest as allowed by law.
- C. Declaratory judgment at the action of Defendants was under color of law or totally outside the law and violated clearly established law(s) (Common Law/Constitution) and human rights.
- D. Declaratory judgment at the action of action of all of the Defendants for CONSPIRACY against the We the People Thanh Tang to deprive her of her property(s).
- E. Injunctive relief ordering all the named Defendants supra to leave Plaintiff alone and not to deprive We the People Thanh Tang secured rights and property under the Preamble.
- F. Such other and further relief as this court may deem appropriate under the circumstances.
- G. The right to amend this Complaint, in accordance pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure – Rule 15, as needed or required.
- H. Demand GRAND JURY Trial of 12 member(s) of We the People. I do not consent to any Magistrate Judge!

DATED: 2/15/11 By: \_\_\_\_\_

We the People Thanh Tang,

14005 WALTER BOWIE # D  
CENTREVILLE, VA 20121  
571-332-7988